



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Robert's studies, however, will doubtless change our conceptions with regard to the methods of Pausanias. Their great value lies in this and in emphasizing the literary and rhetorical spirit of Pausanias as an author and not a merely erudite antiquarian.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

AMERICAN SCHOOL, ATHENS.

A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Augustan Age. By J. WIGHT DUFF, M. A., Professor of Classics, Armstrong College (in the University of Durham), Newcastle-upon-Tyne. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909, 695 pp.

This handsome volume is the latest addition to the series known as the Library of Literary History. It is a model of typographical accuracy and the reader's chief regret upon closing the book will be that the author did not go on with the story beyond the limit imposed. He approaches his theme with a remarkably open mind, his freshness and thoroughness of treatment are evidently derived from a real acquaintance at first hand with the authors as well as with the authorities, and his literary style seems to reflect in its attractive directness and simplicity his own frank and straightforward methods of dealing with the problems before him. Moreover, the taste and skill of his illustrative translations indicate a critic whose independent judgement of literary quality, and whose divination of the final and essential charm of a masterpiece are far better worth recording than is usually the case in works of this sort.

As a matter of fact, however, we have had no works of this sort, at all events, in our own tongue. In conformity with the excellent plan of the series to which it belongs this is a Literary History of Rome, not a History of Roman Literature. The difference is a difference in scope as well as a difference in method. A Literary History of Rome, as its name suggests, covers a wider field; it even includes some account of men like Strabo and others who, though they wrote in Greek, represented in their work and in their life the essential unity of the Graeco-Roman empire. More important still, a work like this owes its existence primarily to the comparatively recent discovery that a correct and adequate interpretation not only of Roman literary art as a whole, but even of the individual masterpiece demands a knowledge far more varied, accurate, and extensive than was dreamed of in those halcyon days of Cruttwell and Simcox when it would seem that a more or less desultory reading of one's favorite authors was a sufficient excuse for writing a history of Roman literature.

It may be fairly doubted, however, whether in those days a book like this could have been written at all. There have always been a few great scholars, who looking ahead from their higher altitude, have been able to direct the steps of those on the lower levels, but speaking in general, the eminence now supporting our modern scholarship as a whole, was slowly raised by that intensive study of classical antiquity which has been going on steadily and methodically for the last sixty or seventy years. The minuteness of these investigations as well as their subjects is still an unfailing source of merriment to many, but it is largely the fund of knowledge so accumulated that furnishes the foundation of a book like this, and that in the long run has created an atmosphere favorable to its reception. For example, now that we are familiar with the doctrine of evolution in the physical world we are quick to detect its presence and to realize its importance in the world of the literary and the aesthetic. We see that no literary phenomenon can be safely termed unique. The individual author, the department he represents, the nation to which he belongs, his environment, his historical significance, the question of literary heredity, the influence of racial evolution or literary evolution, the springs of native feeling, the basis and scope of native criticism, are constantly acting and reacting upon each other; to know one we must know all. In short, the theme of a Literary History of Rome is the articulate record of the mind and personality of a great nation and to interpret it satisfactorily we must explore every available source of contributory knowledge.

A counsel of perfection which is of course beyond the reach of mortal man, but the beneficent effect of it upon this book is seen on every page.

The Introduction (pp. 1-60) is devoted to an interesting and suggestive discussion of standard opinion concerning environment, geographical and tribal origins, history and qualities of the language, and the Roman character and religion.

Professor Duff lays particular stress upon the strong, steady centripetal tendency of thought and ambition. The power of Rome was indeed spiritual as well as temporal. To adopt the closing phrase of a well-known anecdote, Rome was a 'state of mind'—a state of mind impressed first upon the motley population of the Italian peninsula and long afterward upon the babel of nations and tongues comprising a universal empire.

It is interesting to observe, especially for us Americans, that the Romans themselves were undoubtedly of mixed blood. In the literature, too, as among the people, much was exotic. Suetonius himself observed that the earliest writers were 'semi-graeci'; Plautus was an Umbrian, Terence an African, Caecilius an Insubrian Gaul, and so on through a long list of distinguished names, but Professor Duff's suggestion that "Livy's 'Patavinity' was partly of the North" is perhaps capable of discussion. At

all events, this famous utterance of Asinius Pollio is still somewhat cryptic. We can certainly accede to the statement, however, that there may be something Etruscan in the obscurity of Persius. Pichon, the only authority quoted for this observation, also includes Propertius and Tacitus as typical Etruscans. Propertius, however, as Duff observes, 'was at most an Umbrian borderer, and the birthplace of Tacitus is too uncertain to form either the basis or the example of a theory'. The real and illuminating parallel to Persius in this respect, as was noted many years ago, is another Etruscan by the name of Maecenas.

Duff also gives considerable attention to the dialects, to their persistence, particularly in Italy itself, to traces of them in the literary speech, and to the part played by them in forming the so-called *rusticitas Latina* from which the Romance tongues are descended. The discussion is interesting and as a rule, the examples and illustrations, here as elsewhere, are well chosen and incontrovertible. Many, however, will probably object to one of them. This is the statement that 'not a little of the Latin of Apuleius and of Tertullian is due to the way in which people talked their Latin in Africa'. Of course, it is more than likely that the language of Tertullian does preserve some traces of local African usage, it may even be true, that an observant contemporary of Apuleius could have detected a Punicism here and there in his literary style, but the final result of the long dispute upon this question seems to suggest that *Africitas*, so far at least as we of to-day can distinguish it as such, was more a way of writing than a way of talking, a question of rhetoric rather than a question of dialect.

Having given a general review of his theme the author proceeds to develop it in detail. It is a long journey as well as a far cry from the *axamenta* to the *Aeneid*, from Manios the maker of a shawl-pin to Augustus the arbiter of an empire; but the clue is the relentless persistency and consistency of the Roman character and Duff is a sure and inspiring guide. For that very reason it is unnecessary to review his work in detail. I content myself therefore, with a few brief notes and observations suggested by his text.

The bibliographies appended from time to time, though well chosen and generally sufficient, make no attempt to be exhaustive. Criticism, therefore, from this point of view is practically disarmed. Otherwise, I should have suggested that Minton Warren's important contributions (*A. J. P.* XXVIII 249 and 373) to the interpretation of the *Lapis Niger* ought to have been mentioned. So, too, the work of Hendrickson on the early *Satura* (*A. J. P.* XV 1; XIX 285) cannot be safely ignored. If, as he shows, Livy's famous account of the early Italic drama is a mere *rifacimento* of Aristotle at second or third hand it is clear that Nettleship's theory, or anyone's theory, of the *Satura* in so far as it is founded on the suggestion that Roman criticism of the

matter is of real value, needs to be thoroughly revised. Again the statement (p. 114) without qualification or comment that the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is 'ascribed to one Cornificius' is somewhat misleading. A cross reference to his own discussion of Marx's views, on p. 260, would have been advisable.

Not of course, that the latest theory or the generally accepted theory is always the best. Gellius's *plenum superbiae Campanae* for instance, is no proof in itself that Naevius, to whom the words were applied, was a Campanian. Campanian braggadocio was proverbial and as Duff very pertinently observes, "a display of 'Hielan's pride' is conceivable in one who is no Kelt". So too, after discussing Leo's brilliant attempt to explain and demolish the famous story of Plautus as a baker's drudge, Duff goes straight to the heart of the matter (p. 161, n. 1) with the dry comment, 'This is ingenious enough to deserve to be true. But it is beyond proof'.

The chapters on Plautus and Terence and as a rule, on the drama in general, are unusually good, but the scanty and somewhat perfunctory treatment of the mime inevitably suggests, though this can hardly be the case, that Reich's great work was not utilized. It is true that the book is bulky, sometimes inconsidered, and occasionally wordy, but the general results are valuable and illuminating to a high degree.

The statement on p. 330 that Varro (116-27 B. C.) was born 'two years after the death of old Cato' (234-149 B. C.) is due of course, to a slip of the pen or to some oversight in proof-reading.

I observe that Professor Duff perhaps approves of Marx's theory (p. 281, n. 3) that 'the Lucretian invocation to Venus may have been suggested by the fact that Memmius was son-in-law to Sulla, who was devoted to the goddess'. The reasons furnished by the text itself of Lucretius impress me as quite obvious and entirely sufficient.

It has often been observed that of all literary qualities the one most directly affected by the personal equation of the individual reader is humor. Otherwise, I should be surprised by Duff's statement (p. 603) that humor is a rare quality in Ovid—even as Duff might be surprised by my statement that Tibullus echoes the traditional idyllic-erotic type of elegy as modified by the Alexandrians quite as clearly in his humor as in his 'elegiac melancholy'.

The value of studying the departmental in combination with the individual is visible in the recent criticism of nearly every Roman author who has been seriously investigated by competent scholars during the last few decades. A knowledge of departmental tradition for example, proves that Catullus was not a lyric poet but an epigrammatist. This reduces the old dispute over the comparative merits of Catullus and Horace to a matter of personal taste, and justifies Horace's assertion that he 'first wedded the Aeolian lyric to Italian measures'. It also nullifies

the most serious charge against Martial, for Catullus (as well as all his successors) is never more of an epigrammatist than when he chooses to issue 'the coinage of the heart' in phrases 'the like whereof', as Saxe says, 'are not in Watts his hymns'. It also disposes of persons like Vergil's Alexis (p. 440), Horace's Ligurinus and Tibullus's Marathus. No one accustomed to the methods of the Roman poets in dealing with the traditional themes of Greek erotic poetry troubles himself about these literary lay figures. Why should they be any more real than Herrick's Julia?

Of course, as Plessis well says in his recent *Poésie Latine* (A. J. P. XXX 447), there is danger that in the study of literary inheritance the real services, the real genius, of the individual may be misunderstood or underrated. Many of us see a glaring example of it in some of the recent German pronouncements on the genius of Vergil. These, however, neither in Germany nor elsewhere, will seriously affect the wider outlook of sane and thorough scholarship. This is shown by Professor Duff's own words.

'Virgil', he says (p. 482), 'has many claims to greatness. His amazing verbal art is one. His power to touch the feelings is another. His influence on literature, and even his fame in the Middle Ages, are others still. But his historic position alone, as the poet of the empire, would assure him one of the highest places. To minimise his creative gifts—either on the ground of his borrowings and conventions, as if he were a second-hand plagiarist, or on the ground of his conscious aim, as if he overdid the didactic—is to miss the significance of Virgil's relation to his age. In this respect French criticism has more consistently appreciated Virgil than German criticism. English criticism has had its fluctuations. But to write the supreme epic of an empire like the Roman is not given to any but a deep thinker and a great artist'.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY